



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

22
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,809	12/21/2000	Hideki Etori		6576

30132 7590 09/30/2003

GEORGE A. LOUD
3137 MOUNT VERNON AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22305

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

CRUZ, MAGDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2851

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/740,809	ETORI ET AL.	
	Examiner Magda Cruz	Art Unit 2851	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 August 2003</u> .			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.		2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>16 August 2002</u> is: a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:			
1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.	

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4 and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe, et al.

Watanabe, et al. (US Patent Number 6,262,840 B1) discloses a see-through light transmitting type screen (Figure 15) comprising a light scattering layer (11, 41) having a front-scattering property; wherein the light scattering layer (11, 41; i.e. transparent object) consists of a transparent binder (26) containing spherical microparticles (12) disposed on a projector side and/or a viewer side (Figure 7); further comprising an anti-reflection layer (28) provided on at least one side of the light scattering layer (Figure 24); wherein the transparent binder is glass or high molecular resin (column 13, lines 23-31). The transparent layer has a refraction index (n) lower than that of the transparent binder of the light scattering layer (column 15, lines 2-6). The transparent layer has a refraction index higher than that of the transparent binder of the light scattering layer (column 14, lines 16-20). The spherical microparticles have a mean

particle diameter of 1 μm – 10.0 μm (column 11, lines 44-45). Said microparticles (12) do not protrude from the light-scattering layer (see Figure 15). An anti-reflection layer (28) is provided on at least one side of the light scattering layer (column 10, lines 59-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Watanabe, et al.

Watanabe, et al. (US Patent Number 6,262,840 B1) teaches the salient features of the present invention, including the spherical microparticles having a mean particle diameter of 1.0 μm - 10.0 μm (column 11, lines 51-56), and a refraction index relative to that of the transparent binder (column 12, lines 15-21). Furthermore, Watanabe, et al. explains how it's possible to obtain a desired diffusion angle by selecting refractive indexes of the respective parts and members of the screen. Watanabe, et al. inherently discloses that the refraction index relative to that of the transparent binder n satisfy the relation $0.91 < n < 1.09$ ($n \neq 1$).

Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to utilize a transparent binder, which satisfies the

relation $0.91 < n < 1.09$ ($n \neq 1$), for the purpose of having a light converging effect

determined in response to a value of the refractive index (column 12, lines 6-8).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Watanabe, et al. in view of Iwata, et al.

Watanabe, et al. (US Patent Number 6,262,840 B1) teaches the salient features of the present invention, except a screen having a haze of 3.0% or more and distinctness of image of 60.0% or more.

Iwata, et al. (US Patent Number 6,327,088 B1) discloses haze and distinctness values (column 3, lines 24-28; Table 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the haze and distinctness values disclosed by Iwata, et al. in Watanabe, et al.'s invention, for the purpose of preventing the occurrence of the reflection rays out of incident rays coming from outside (column 3, lines 11-14).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 08/04/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that the prior art does not teach the a "see-through" screen, the microparticles are not sufficiently small particle size to allow "see-through", and that there is no suitable relationship between the refractive index of the microparticle and that of the surrounding binder. However, Watanabe, et al. (US Patent Number 6,262,840 B1) teaches such "see-through" screen (column 11, lines 22-27), the

Art Unit: 2851

microparticles are sufficiently small particle size to allow "see-through" (column 11, lines 40-56), and *there is* a suitable relationship between the refractive index of the microparticle and that of the surrounding binder (column 14, lines 54-61).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Magda Cruz whose telephone number is (703)308-6367. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russ Adams can be reached on (703)308-2847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1782.



RUSSELL ADAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Magda Cruz
Patent Examiner
September 15, 2003